

REMARKS

Claims 1-3, 5-12, 31, and 35-79 are pending and stand rejected.

Claim 42 is amended herein.

Accordingly, claims 1-3, 5-12, 31, and 35-79 are pending upon entry of this amendment.

Based on the above Amendment and the following Remarks, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider all outstanding objections and rejections, and withdraw them.

Interview Summary

Applicants thank the Examiner for her time in conducting a telephone interview on June 30, 2008 with Applicants' representative Robert R. Sachs and Matthew Harvey. During the telephone interview, Applicants' representative and the Examiner discussed Huang (U.S. Patent Application Publication 2004/0003038) and the claim language of independent claims 1, 42, and 61. An agreement was reached that Huang does not disclose at least the claimed feature, "responsive to the event, determining an event schema associated with the type of the article."

During the telephone interview, Applicants' representative and the Examiner also discussed the rejection of claims 42-60 under 35 U.S.C. §101. An agreement was reached that inclusion of the phrase "computer readable storage medium" in independent claim 42 would overcome the §101 rejection. It was also agreed that support for such language is present in the specification.

Response to Rejection Under 35 USC 101

Claims 42-60 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §101 as allegedly being directed to non-statutory subject matter. Claim 42 has been amended such that claims 42-60 are now directed

to a computer readable storage medium. Support may be found in paragraph [0013] of the specification. Accordingly, withdrawal of the §101 rejection is respectfully requested.

Response to Rejections Under 35 USC 102(e) and 35 USC 103(a)

Claims 1-3, 10, 12, 35-36, 40-45, 49-50, 52, 53, 61-65, 68-69, and 71 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by Huang (U.S. Patent Application Publication 2004/0003038). Claims 5-9, 11, 38, 39, 47, 54-60, 66, and 73-79 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Huang in view of Cotton (U.S. Patent 7,016,919). Claims 31, 37, 48, 51, 67, and 70 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Huang in view of Schumacher (U.S. Patent 6,532,023).

Applicants respectfully traverse these rejections as applied to the amended claims. Independent claim 1, as amended, recites “storing a plurality of different event schemas, each event schema associated with at least one of the types of articles;” and “responsive to the event, determining an event schema associated with the type of the article.”

Huang does not disclose the claimed method. To the contrary, Huang uses the same schema for all events. Huang mentions different schemas, but each of these are used for different parts of a single process (paragraphs [0067-0075], FIGS. 7A, 7B, 8A, 8B, 8C). This same process executes in response to all events. Thus, Huang does not disclose at least the feature of “responsive to the event, determining an event schema associated with the type of the article.”

Independent claims 42 and 61 also recite “responsive to the event, determining an event schema associated with the type of the article”. Thus, Huang does not disclose the elements of these claims, and hence independent claims 1, 42, and 61 are allowable over Huang. The

dependent claims incorporate the limitations of their respective base claims and are allowable for at least the same reasons.

With respect to claims 5-9, 11, 38, 39, 47, 54-60, 66, and 73-79, the combination of Huang and Cotton does not disclose or suggest the limitations of these claims, at least in part because Cotton does not remedy the deficiencies of Huang, as described above. Specifically, Cotton does not disclose at least the feature of “responsive to the event, determining an event schema associated with the type of the article,” which was shown above to be absent from Huang. Accordingly, Huang and Cotton in combination do not disclose the elements of these claims.

With respect to claims 31, 37, 48, 51, 67, and 70, the combination of Huang and Schumacher does not disclose or suggest the limitations of these claims, at least in part because Schumacher does not remedy the deficiencies of Huang, as described above. Specifically, Schumacher does not disclose at least the feature of “responsive to the event, determining an event schema associated with the type of the article,” which was shown above to be absent from Huang. Accordingly, Huang and Schumacher in combination do not disclose the elements of these claims.

The Examiner is encouraged to contact the undersigned attorney if it would be beneficial to further advance the prosecution of the application.

Respectfully submitted,
MIHAI FLORIN IONESCU ET AL.

Dated: July 7, 2008

By: /Robert R. Sachs/

Robert R. Sachs, Reg. No. 42,120
Attorney for Applicants

Fenwick & West LLP
Silicon Valley Center
801 California Street
Mountain View, CA 94041
Tel.: (415) 875-2410
Fax: (415) 281-1350
Email: rsachs@fenwick.com